MOTION FILED
OCT 29 1991

(3)

No. 91-703

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1991

GUSTO RECORDS, INC. AND G.M.L., INC.,

Petitioners,

vs.

B.J. THOMAS, GENE F. PITNEY, SHIRLEY OWENS ALSTON, DORIS COLEY JACKSON, BEVERLY LEE AND VERNON McFADDEN, JR.,

Respondents.

Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Sixth Circuit

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF AND BRIEF OF DOMINION ENTERTAINMENT, INC. AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Bob Lynch, Jr.
222 Second Avenue, North
Suite 316
Nashville, TN 37201
612-255-2888
Attorney for Dominion Entertainment, Inc.

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO., (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. WHETHER A PURCHASER OF MASTER RECORDINGS ASSUMES THE UNPAID ROYALTY OBLIGATIONS OF PRIOR OWNERS OF THE MASTER RECORDINGS.

2. WHETHER A RECORDING AGREEMENT MAY BE REWRITTEN TO RECONSTRUCT ROYALTY OBLIGATIONS OF A LICENSOR OF MASTER RECORDINGS.

No. _____

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1991

GUSTO RECORDS, INC. AND G.M.L., INC.,

Petitioners,

vs.

B.J. THOMAS, GENE F. PITNEY, SHIRLEY OWENS ALSTON, DORIS COLEY JACKSON, BEVERLY LEE AND VERNON McFADDEN, JR.,

Respondents.

Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Sixth Circuit

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Pursuant to Rule 37 of the Rules of this Court, Dominion Entertainment, Inc. respectfully moves the Court for leave to file a Brief Amicus Curiae in the above-captioned case in support of the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. Petitioners have granted their consent to this filing. Respondents have not.

INTEREST OF DOMINION ENTERTAINMENT, INC.

Dominion Entertainment, Inc. is in the business of, among other things, purchasing master recordings and

obtaining and issuing licenses to make sound recordings. In this case, the decision of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals would be harmful to the interests of Dominion Entertainment, Inc. and to the recording industry as a whole, and not just to the interests of the Petitioners in this case. By ruling that the purchaser of master recordings thereby assumes all previous unpaid royalty obligations of prior owners of the master recordings, and by redefining the term "licensee" as it is used in recording contracts used throughout the industry, the Court of Appeals has effectively rewritten many licensing agreements and has changed the economic interest of all who buy and sell master recordings. Moreover, the Petitioners appear not to have addressed fully the question of law as to whether a mere purchaser of master recordings assumes any artist royalty obligations by the mere purchase of that master recording.

CONCLUSION

For all of these reasons, Dominion Entertainment, Inc. respectfully asks that the Court grant its Motion for Leave to File its Brief as Amicus Curiae in this case in support of the grant of the Petition for Certiorari to review the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Respectfully submitted,

Bob Lynch, Jr.
222 Second Avenue, North
Suite 316
Nashville, TN 37201
612-255-2888
Attorney for Dominion Entertainment, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES v

ARGUMENT 1

A. Whether a purchaser of master recordings assumes no royalty obligations to an artist .. 1

B. A licensing record company should not be robbed of the benefit of its bargain by a redefinition of "licensee" 3

CONCLUSION 4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

STATUTE

California Resale Royalties Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1986 (1977 as amended in 1983) 2

MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES

Patry, *Latman's The Copyright Law*, pgs. 88 and 89 (6th Ed. 1986) 2

BRIEF OF DOMINION ENTERTAINMENT, INC., AMICUS CURIAE

INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE

The interest of Amicus Curiae is set out in the Motion for Leave to File, ***supra.***

ARGUMENT

A. A purchaser of master recordings assumes no royalty obligations to an artist.

The divided court below found that the Petitioners, as purchasers of master recordings, somehow assumed the unpaid royalty obligations of all previous owners of those master recordings. On a Petition to Rehear, the divided Sixth Circuit affirmed this decision. Dominion Entertainment, Inc. asserts that the Petition for Certiorari should be granted in order that the Court may review this fundamentally erroneous decision which would upset the economic balance of the recording industry, particularly of companies which purchase master recordings. This case is apparently a case of first impression. Moreover, Dominion Entertainment, Inc. asserts that a mere purchaser of master recordings does not assume any obligation to pay artist royalties because those artist royalties are purely a creation of contract between the artist and the record company with which he originally entered a contract.

If we assume that Artist signs a recording contract with Record Company, and makes, pursuant to that contract, a master recording which Record Company owns,

then the impact of this decision will be clearly illustrated. The contract calls for Record Company to pay Artist royalties upon sales of records made from the master recordings. Artist receives royalties from Record Company for several years and then Record Company, as it has the right to do under the contract, sells the master recordings. Record Company B, the buyer of the master recordings, also makes and sells records from those masters and pays a license fee for that right, either in a single lump sum payment to Record Company, or a percentage of each record sold. Record Company B ultimately resells the master recordings and they are resold several times.

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has held that the final purchaser in a chain of several purchasers assumes all unpaid royalty obligations of previous owners of the masters. This is despite the fact that none of the owners of the master recordings other than originally contracting Record Company has any contractual relationship with the Artist.

Under fundamental legal principles, one not a party to a contract is not bound by its obligations. Moreover, there is no inherent or enforceable moral right merely because one owns a master recording and makes records therefrom, to pay the recording artist whose voice is embodied thereon a royalty. This is to be contrasted with the concept of *droit moral*, a legal doctrine recognized in European countries. *See, e.g., Patry, Latman's The Copyright Law*, pgs. 88 and 89 (6th. Ed. 1986). Additionally, California became the first and only state to grant to an artist by statute a *droit de suite*, a right to share in proceeds from a resale of works made by the artist unless the right is waived by a written contract. In passing the *California*

Resale Royalties Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1986 (1977 as amended in 1983), the California legislature recognized that an artist has no inherent right to receive monetary gain from the resale of his work. American law has developed contrary to European law on this question. The decision of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals otherwise should be reviewed and reversed.

Likewise, but for additional reasons, a mere purchaser of master recordings does not succeed to any unpaid royalty obligations of previous owners of masters because a purchaser of an asset does not automatically assume the obligations of previous owners. This is true regardless of whether the item purchased is a master recording or some other tangible good. To hold otherwise would be to chill, if not completely stop, the purchase of master recordings by companies such as Dominion Entertainment, Inc. Were it liable for any royalty obligations which may have been unpaid years and years ago, it may very well choose not to purchase master recordings.

B. A licensing Record Company should not be robbed of the benefit of its bargain by a redefinition of "licensee."

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals effectively rewrote not only the contracts between the Respondents and the Petitioners, but its logic and precedent would effectively rewrite most, if not all, standard industry recording agreements and licensing agreements. The Sixth Circuit defined "licensee" in a standard recording industry contract to mean only a licensee which is affiliated with the licensor. It held that if a record company

licensed a master recording in a genuine arms-length transaction, it would be obligated to pay the recording artist fifty percent (50%) of all license fees received from the licensee, despite the fact that its contract with the Artist provided only for a smaller percentage (2 to 2 1/2%) as a royalty to be paid from licensee fees. To rewrite the contract by redefining license is both intellectually dishonest and unsupportable.

To ignore the contract and allow the rewriting of license agreements would be disastrous to all record companies which license their master recordings for obvious reasons. Were the contractual expectation of the licensor only an obligation to pay two percent (2%), yet under a court's scrutiny that obligation becomes fifty percent (50%) of all fees received, economic chaos would ensue.

CONCLUSION

For all of these reasons, Dominion Entertainment, Inc. as amicus curiae would urge the court to grant the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and vacate its judgment.

Bob Lynch, Jr.
222 Second Avenue, North
Suite 316
Nashville, TN 37201
612-255-2888
Attorney for Dominion Entertainment, Inc.